


88-1607

No.



IN THE

**Supreme Court
of the United States**

OCTOBER TERM, 1984

Edward Curley

Petitioner.

v.

Johanna H. Curley

Respondent.

Petition for Writ of Certiorari
To The New Jersey
Superior Court Appellate Division

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Edward Curley, pro se
3 Chippewa Road
Toms River
New Jersey 08753
(201) 929-0917

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

QUESTION I

WHETHER THE PETITIONER'S RIGHTS
UNDER THE 4th AMENDMENT TO THE
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION HAS
BEEN VIOLATED.

QUESTION II

WHETHER THE PETITIONER'S RIGHTS
UNDER THE 14th AMENDMENT TO THE
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION HAS
BEEN VIOLATED.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Questions Presented.i
Table of Contents.ii
Table of Authoritiesii
Opinions Below3
Statement of Jurisdiction.4
Statement of Procedural History.5
Statement of Facts19
Reasons for Granting the Writ.23
AppendixA-1

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Constitution of the United States.4
--	----

No.

IN THE

**Supreme Court
of the United States**

OCTOBER TERM, 1984

Edward Curley

Petitioner.

v.

Johanna H. Curley

Respondent.

Petition for Writ of Certiorari
To The New Jersey
Superior Court Appellate Division

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

The Petitioner, Edward Curley, respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgement of the New Jersey Superior Court Appellate Division entered in this proceeding on September 26, 1983 for which a petition for certification was denied by the Supreme Court of New Jersey on November 21, 1983 and for which a request for clarification of the Order in error was subsequently executed and request for

re-consideration of the petition for certification was denied on or about January 4, 1984 as recorded with CORRECTED ORDER ON PETITION FOR CERTIFICATION filed by the Supreme Court of New Jersey on January 4, 1984.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the New Jersey Superior Court Appellate Division entered on September 26, 1983 appears in the Appendix at p. A-1.

The denial of the Supreme Court of New Jersey of petition for certification on November 21, 1983 appears in the Appendix at p. A-7.

The denial of the Supreme Court of New Jersey of re-consideration of the petition for certification on or about January 4, 1984 as recorded with CORRECTED ORDER ON PETITION FOR CERTIFICATION filed on January 4, 1984 appears in the Appendix at p. A-12.

JURISDICTION

The New Jersey Superior Court Appellate Division entered it's judgment on September 26, 1983 and the Supreme Court of New Jersey denied petition for certification despite the merits of constitutional issues involved. Petitioner invokes this Court's jurisdiction under the Constitution of the United States. The petitioner is a born citizen of the United States and the respondent is a foreign national.

STATEMENT OF PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On March 12, 1979 Judge James M. Havey, Superior Court of New Jersey, entered a dual judgment of divorce in this matter under docket number M-14581-76 awarding joint custody of the two children of the marriage and ordering the petitioner to pay child support to the respondent (Da41). On June 1, 1980 the youngest child elected to stay in the custody of the petitioner full time. On August 4, 1980 the eldest child elected to stay in the custody of the petitioner full time. The oldest child was emancipated by marriage on March 14, 1981 (Da131) and continued to reside with the petitioner till departure on or about September, 1981.

CHILD SUPPORT: On December 3, 1981 the petitioner applied to the court for child support needed for the youngest still depend-

ent child (Dal24).

On December 18, 1981 Judge Edward A. Costigan heard the petitioner's application for child support but reserved decision pending his review of the entire case file (Dal35).

On May 5, 1982 Judge Donald F. Campbell heard the petitioner's application for child support and denied child support in Order dated March 16, 1982 (Dal79). Petitioner filed an appeal of this Order on June 10, 1982 and docket number A-4747-81T1 was assigned (Dal91).

On May 24, 1982 petitioner applied to the court for child support (Dal82).

On June 4, 1982 Judge Donald F. Campbell heard the petitioner's application for child support and denied child support in Order dated June 24, 1982 (Da211). Petitioner

filed an appeal of this Order on August 6, 1982 and docket number A-5756-81T1 was assigned (Da216).

On August 13, 1982 petitioner applied to the court for child support (Dal).

On September 3, 1982 Judge Donald F. Campbell heard the petitioner's application for child support and child support was denied, by Judge Irving W. Rubin, in Order dated September 23, 1982 (Da26). Petitioner filed an appeal of this Order on November 4, 1982 and docket number A-1050-82T1 was assigned (Dal34).

On October 1, 1982 petitioner applied to the court for re-consideration of Judge Rubin's Order (Da26).

On October 22, 1982 Judge Donald F. Campbell heard the application for re-consideration of child support and reserved

decision on child support in order dated November 29, 1982 (Da156). Petitioner filed an appeal of this Order on January 12, 1983 and docket number A-2106-82T3 was assigned (Da166).

On October 15, 1982 petitioner applied to the court for child support (Da43).

On October 29, 1982 Judge Donald F. Campbell heard the application for child support and denied child support in Order dated November 24, 1982 (Da154). Petitioner filed an appeal of this Order on January 6, 1983 and docket number A-1964-82T3 was assigned (Da164).

On September 26, 1983 all appeals were denied (DPa3)&(A-1).

On October 15, 1983 Notice of Petition was submitted to the New Jersey Supreme Court (DPa7). Petition was denied November 21,

1983 (A-7), clarification and request for reconsideration was sought December 8, 1983

(A-9) and a Corrected Order once more denying Petition for Certification was filed January 4, 1984 (A-12).

SEIZURE OF ASSETS & ALLEGED CONTEMPT:

Despite proof supplied to the court of petitioner's need and entitlement to child support assistance from a most affluent non-custodial parent (respondent) pursuit of the respondent's assets, without justifiable reason, was given top priority by the court.

On July 31, 1981 an Order was signed by Judge Eugene D. Serpentelli in favor of the respondent in the arbitrary amount of \$3,350 plus interest of \$190 changed to 8% then escalated to 12%, by respondent's attorney, along with \$150 legal fees. Only unjustified alimony and legal fees were given consider-

ation by the court, petitioner's need for child support assistance was once more set aside and application for a Stay pending sought after decision by the Supreme Court of the United States was denied.

On October 13, 1981, without any prior notification a Writ of Execution was issued by Judge William A. Dreier against Stocks in American Can Co. which petitioner did not have, making compliance impossible. On November 26, 1981 petitioner wrote Judge Dreier (Dal21) submitting that the Writ be rescinded and on December 3, 1981 Judge Dreier replied (Dal34) saying that matters should be directed to the matrimonial Judge in Ocean County or the Appellate Division of New Jersey. On December 3, 1981 the petitioner made application to the court for a rescinding of the Writ signed by Judge

Dreier (Dal24 & 125).

On December 18, 1981 during a hearing Judge Edward A. Costigan delayed making any decision until he read the entire case file despite proofs provided of changed circumstances and the petitioner's financial hardship.

On December 19, 1981 petitioner sent a letter (Dal36) to Judge Costigan highlighting an emergent need for child support calling for immediate action and this was never responded to.

On February 26, 1982 a hearing was scheduled without petitioner's knowledge, petitioner learned of this hearing when the Ocean County Clerk's office notified petitioner that the hearing was re-scheduled for March 5, 1982. On March 2, 1982 a letter (Dal68) was received from the chambers

of Judge Donald J. Campbell, this letter attempted to cover-up and obscure actions surrounding Judge Costigan's hearing of December 18, 1981 and the scheduling of a hearing on February 26, 1982 without notification to the petitioner. Petitioner responded by letter to Judge Campbell (Dal67) presenting clear unequivocal truthful facts, substantiated by documentation and court transcript, proving that statements in the letter from his chambers were false.

On March 5, 1982 Judge Campbell denied child support to the custodial petitioner and instead gave the non-custodial respondent's attorney license to proceed in whatever manner he desired to obtain monies from the custodial petitioner.

On March 8, 1982 a proposed Order of the March 5, 1982 hearing was forwarded to Judge

Campbell and petitioner received a copy of this unsigned, undated proposed Order to which petitioner timely submitted an objection on March 11, 1982.

On May 13, 1982 respondent executed a Notice of Motion to hold the petitioner in contempt of court for non-compliance of a Court Order signed and dated March 16, 1982. Respondent also moved for an assignment of petitioner's interest in an employee Capital Accumulation Plan still to be released to the petitioner due to unemployment.

On May 24, 1982 petitioner filed a Notice of Counter-Motion with Supporting Affidavit (Dal82 & 183) highlighting the fact that petitioner first saw the signed copy of the March 16, 1982 Court Order on receipt of respondent's May 13, 1982 Motion. The Court Order should never have been executed since

it was knowingly impossible for the petitioner to comply with the Order. On two occasions during the March 5, 1982 hearing of the matter, the Court and petitioner's adversary were informed and acknowledged that Stocks ordered to be turned over were already dissipated to pay delinquent accrued bills. Change of Circumstance due to petitioner's unemployment as of April 30, 1982 was presented to the Court and petitioner requested specific relief which included much needed Child Support.

On June 4, 1982 during a hearing Judge Campbell gave the respondent's attorney license to draft an Order assigning the unemployed petitioner's interest in the American Can Co. Capital Accumulation Plan to the respondent in the newly deliberately unduly escalated arbitrary amount of \$4,306

plus \$400 unjustified award of legal fees. All relief was denied the petitioner despite the Court's knowledge of petitioner's unemployment while having full custody of a dependent child of the marriage with a need for child support assistance.

On June 10, 1982 petitioner filed a Notice of Appeal Nunc pro tunc along with a request for emergent relief thru Stay of proceedings with the Appellate Division of New Jersey (Da191 thru 198) and this Stay was denied petitioner despite presentation by affidavit of petitioner's unemployment and need for child support assistance.

On June 12, 1982 petitioner received a copy of an unsigned proposed Order on the Motion of June 4, 1982 (Da199) and on June 14, 1982 petitioner filed an Objection to Part of Order of the Motion of June 4, 1982

(Da201) related to Court Order of March 16, 1982.

On June 18, 1982 petitioner received a copy of an Order (Da202) from the Superior Court of New Jersey Appellate Division denying petitioner's application for a Stay.

On June 28, 1982 petitioner submitted a Notice of Motion and Supporting Affidavit (Da204 & 205) to the Supreme Court of New Jersey for a Stay of Proceedings Relative to Court Order dated March 16, 1982 and this Motion for a Stay pending appeal was denied (Da215) despite clear presentation of petitioner's need for emergent relief relative to much needed child support assistance, unjust pursuit of unemployment assets and contrived contempt of court charges.

ASSIGNING OF SIGNATURE: On August 13, 1983 being still unemployed and in need of

financial relief while having custody of the dependent child of the marriage, the petitioner filed a Notice of Motion for Enforcement of Litigant's Rights and Certain Specified Relief (Dal. thru 10).

On September 3, 1982 during a hearing on petitioner's Motion for Child Support and enforcement of other rights Judge Campbell authorized the respondent's attorney to sign the unemployed petitioner's name to seize severance assets due the unemployed petitioner because of job termination. A Court Order (Da26) which did not agree with the hearing decisions of Judge Campbell was signed by Judge Irving W. Rubin on September 23, 1982. The petitioner moved with Notice of Motion for Re-consideration of the September 23, 1982 Order and during a hearing on October 22, 1982 Judge Campbell authorized the petitioner

to revise the Order (Dal56) which was signed November 29, 1982 properly reflecting the Judge's authorizing respondent's attorney to sign the petitioner's name to obtain the unemployed petitioner's assets while reserving decision on petitioner's request for needed child support.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Dual Judgment of Divorce entered in this case under docket number M-14581-76 resulted in the respondent receiving approximately 53% of alleged marital assets plus an Outlet Store owned by the petitioner. A form of Joint Custody awarded the children of the marriage to be seven (7) months with the respondent and five (5) months with the petitioner. Child Support payments were set at \$55 per week to respondent for each child when with the respondent and \$30 per week to respondent for each child when with the petitioner. Rehabilitative Alimony payments to the respondent of \$75 per week for 18 months ended April 30, 1980 and permanent Alimony of \$40 per week, awarded despite respondent's proven adultery and lack of need, was continued. A portion of respond-

ent's legal fees were ordered to be paid by the petitioner in the amount of \$1,750 with no specified time of payment. A further result of the Dual Judgment of Divorce was the Court's sanctifying respondent's theft of the petitioner's personal property with an estimated value of \$2,560.

Petitioner appealed the March 12, 1979 Judgment of Divorce on April 24, 1979 and Appellate Division docket number A-2926-78 was assigned.

Petitioner made all payments according to the Judgment of Divorce until both children of the marriage elected to stay full time with the petitioner in the marital home, at this point petitioner stopped paying child support and continued paying alimony even though respondent was not entitled to alimony.

Petitioner stopped paying alimony upon

discovery of respondent's co-habiting with respondent's pre-divorce paramour and respondent's vacationing in Europe while petitioner was in need of child support.

Upon petitioner's notification to the Ocean County probation department of the respondent's departure to Europe and the justified withholding of unjustified alimony by the petitioner with full custody of the children of the marriage, the probation department moved on behalf of the non-custodial respondent to obtain alleged arrearages supposedly accrued while the petitioner was fully supporting the children with absolutely no assistance from the respondent.

Petitioner countered the unjust action of the probation department with a Response and Affidavit timely filed with the Court (Da60 & 61) highlighting the fact that the

petitioner was appealing the case in an effort to have petitioner's rights enforced as entitled to under the Statutes and Constitution of New Jersey. This appeal process has to date never ended since petitioner's attempts to obtain much needed child support and other relief thru the Superior Courts, Appellate Division, Supreme Court of New Jersey and the Supreme Court of the United States have been thwarted by discrimination and bias along with counteractions and false claims which have no bearing on the major issue of child support and the security of personal assets.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRITQUESTION I

WHETHER THE PETITIONER'S RIGHTS
UNDER THE 4th AMENDMENT TO THE
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION HAS
BEEN VIOLATED.

The court authorized the respondent's attorney to sign the petitioner's name to seize petitioner's assets.

Petitioner's assets were seized at a time of much need while petitioner was unemployed with full custody of a dependent child. At the same time, petitioner was being denied child support assistance, by the New Jersey courts, from a most affluent non-custodial parent (respondent).

The New Jersey courts have failed to provide protection of the petitioner's rights under the Constitution of New Jersey and did

in fact knowingly violate petitioner's rights in a manner which has convinced the petitioner that there is no such thing as being secure in ones person, house, papers and effects as stated in the Constitution of New Jersey.

QUESTION II

WHETHER THE PETITIONER'S RIGHTS
UNDER THE 14th AMENDMENT TO THE
UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION HAS
BEEN VIOLATED.

The courts of New Jersey have wilfully discriminated against the petitioner with blatant repeated denials of requested award of much needed child support assistance from a highly affluent non-custodial parent.

Through limited discovery awarded by the court, the petitioner was able to establish the fact that the respondent was avoiding

parental duty to help support the dependent child of the marriage through claiming to be earning less money than the amounts ultimately revealed and clearly recognized by the court. Despite this the court still withheld any award of needed child support even while the custodial petitioner was unemployed.

The courts of New Jersey withheld child support for the child of the marriage even when having full irrefutable knowledge that while the non-custodial affluent respondent was vacationing in Europe, respondent's attorney entered a sworn to affidavit claiming his client, the respondent, could no longer afford him. This sworn to affidavit was submitted by this attorney within weeks of his having provided legal service to the respondent for respondent's purchase of a \$65,000 house.

The petitioner has been clearly discriminated against and subjected to bias in the New Jersey Courts in full violation of the Statutes and Constitution of the State of New Jersey.

CONCLUSION


The petitioner most respectfully requests that the Supreme Court of the United States grant a Writ of Certiorari to review and hear this matter.

In view of the facts presented and the available proofs which highlight the violations of the petitioner's rights under the Constitution of the United States, the petitioner most respectfully requests that the Supreme Court of the United States enforce recognition of the petitioner's constitutional rights in the New Jersey Courts.

Further, the petitioner most respectfully requests that the Supreme Court of the United States exercise it's power to determine and enforce the petitioner's marital rights in the State of New Jersey.

Since various States and the Federal Government are emphasizing allocation and payment of child support with children being entitled to a determination based on their best interests the petitioner respectfully submits that resolution of this matter is of importance to the general public. Their can be no credibility to taking extreme actions against so-called delinquent fathers who fail to provide child support if our court system fails to pursue action against any delinquent parent, regardless of sex, or an attorney or judge who may be delinquent in seeing to the proper provision of child support.

Respectfully submitted,


Edward Curley
pro se

Dated:

March 31, 1984

3 Chippewa Road
Toms River, N.J. 08753
(201) 929-0917

A-1

APPENDIX A-1

NOT FOR PUBLICATION WITHOUT THE
APPROVAL OF THE COMMITTEE ON OPINIONS

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
APPELLATE DIVISION

DOCKET NOS. A-4747-81T3

A-5756-81T3

A-1050-82T3

JOHANNA A. CURLEY,

A-1964-82T3

A-2106-82T3

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

EDWARD CURLEY,

Defendant-Appellant.

Submitted September 12, 1983 -

Decided SEP 26 1983 Before

Judges Bischoff and Petrella.

On appeal from the New Jersey
Superior Court, Chancery
Division, Ocean County.

Edward Curley, pro se.

Respondent did not file a brief.

PER CURIAM

The marriage of the parties to this litigation was terminated by the entry of a dual judgment of divorce on March 12, 1979. On appeal, that judgment was affirmed by this Court on December 29, 1980.

Subsequent motions for relief filed by both parties resulted in defendant filing five appeals, two were heretofore consolidated and the remaining three were also consolidated. We hereby now consolidate all five appeals and will dispose of them all in this one opinion.

On November 25, 1981 plaintiff filed a notice of motion for an order compelling defendant to turn over certain stocks owned by defendant. This was based upon a levy effectuated by the Sheriff of Ocean County in aid of a judgment obtained by plaintiff against defendant. Defendant

filed a cross-motion for an order rescinding the turn-over order, elimination of alimony, child support and for monetary credits.

After a hearing the trial judge entered an order dated March 16, 1982 providing the defendant must turn over to the Sheriff of Ocean County the stock in question for sale to satisfy the judgment. The relief requested by defendant was denied.

On May 13, 1982 plaintiff filed a notice of motion seeking to hold defendant in contempt and to effectuate an assignment of defendant's interest in the distribution of the American Can Company Capital Accumulation Plan to the extent of the judgment. The defendant filed a responsive application. By order dated September 23, 1982 the trial judge directed that defendant's interest in the Capital Accumulation Plan be assigned to

the plaintiff to the extent of \$4,700. He granted, in part, defendant's request for financial disclosure by plaintiff.

Defendant appealed from both these orders (A-4747-81T3 & A-5756-81T3) and those two appeals were previously consolidated.

The other three appeals were the result of subsequent orders dated September 23, 1982, November 24, 1982, November 29, 1982. These orders disposed of motions filed by both plaintiff and defendant seeking various types of relief including financial relief due to changed circumstances resulting from defendant's unemployed status, discovery of assets, vacation of the prior order of assignment of assets and reconsideration of certain prior orders.

On these appeals defendant's

contentions as they are stated in his brief,
are as follows:

POINT I THE UNEMPLOYED DEFENDANT HAS COURT RECOGNIZED FULL CUSTODY OF THE ONLY REMAINING DEPENDENT CHILD OF THE MARRIAGE AND IS BEING UNJUSTLY DENIED ENTITLED TO CHILD SUPPORT FROM THE NON-CUSTODIAL PARENT WHO IS GAINFULLY EMPLOYED AND FINANCIALLY ABLE TO ASSIST WITH THE CHILD'S SUPPORT PER CONTEXT OF SUPPORT UNDER N.J. S.A.2A: 17-56.1, 2A:34-23, 9:2-4, 9:2-13 & 9:2-15.

POINT II THE DEFENDANT IS BEING UNJUSTLY DENIED ANY AND ALL RELIEF ENTITLED TO UNDER THE STATUTES AND CONSTITUTION OF NEW JERSEY WITH VIOLATION OF THE DEFENDANT'S HUMAN, CIVIL AND UNITED STATES CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS.

POINT III DESPITE CHANGED CIRCUMSTANCES PROVEN TO AND RECOGNIZED BY THE COURT, THE PRESENTLY UNEMPLOYED DEFENDANT IS BEING DELIBERATELY UNJUSTLY HELD SUBJECT TO PAY ALIMONY TO THE PLAINTIFF WHO IS OWNER-MANAGER OF THRIVING BUSINESSES WHO NEVER WAS AND IS NOT IN FINANCIAL NEED.

POINT IV THE DEFENDANT IS BEING DENIED

CREDITS DUE FOR UNJUSTIFIED
FORCED ALIMONY PAYMENTS,
ENTITLED TO CHILD SUPPORT AND
LOSS OF PERSONAL BELONGINGS
THRU PLAINTIFF'S THEFT AS
PRESENTED TO THE COURT.

POINT V

THE DEFENDANT IS BEING SUB-
JECTED TO ONGOING UNJUSTIFIED
HARASSMENT CONSTITUTING
BARRATRY (9C.J.S.) AND DIS-
CRIMINATION IN THE COURTS
WHILE BEING INNOCENT OF ANY
MARITAL OR CRIMINAL WRONG-
DOING AND IS A VICTIM OF
BLATANT HUMAN, CIVIL AND
CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATIONS AND
TO EXTREME UNDUE HARDSHIP
CONSTITUTING CRUEL AND
UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT.

We have carefully studied the
complete record provided us and considered
the arguments advanced by defendant in
support of his contentions. We find all of
the issues raised by defendant to be clearly
without merit. R. 2:11-3(e)(1)(A & E).

Affirmed.

SUPREME COURT OF NEW
JERSEY C-272 SEPTEMBER
TERM 1983

21,831

JOHANNA H. CURLEY, :

Plaintiff-Respondent :

vs. :

EDWARD CURLEY, : ON PETITION FOR
CERTIFICATION

Defendant-Petitioner.:

:

To the Appellate Division, Superior Court:

A petition for certification of the
judgment in A-4747/5756-81T1 having been sub-
mitted to this Court, and the Court having
considered the same;

It is ORDERED that the petition for
certification is denied with costs.

WITNESS, the Honorable Robert N.
Wilentz, Chief Justice, at Trenton, this 21st

A-8

day of November, 1983.

Stephen W. Townsend

Clerk

FILED

SUPREME COURT

Nov 28, 1983

A-9

3 Chippewa Road
Toms River
New Jersey 08753

December 8, 1983

CM # P 386 526 506

Clerk
Supreme Court of New Jersey
Justice Complex
Trenton, N.J. 08625

Re: Curley v. Curley
Docket No. 21,831
Appeal No. A-4747-81T1
A-5756-81T1
A-1050-82T1
A-1964-82T3
A-2106-82T3
All consolidated under
T3

Dear Sir or Madam:

The attached copy of Order Denying
Petition for Certification addresses only two
of the above noted originally consolidated
appeals, A-4747-81T1 and A-5756-81T1. The
second group of originally consolidated
appeals A-1050-82T1, A-1964-82T3 and A-2106-

82T3 are not mentioned in the Order. All five aforementioned appeals were consolidated by the Superior Court Appellate Division.

In view of the important issue of the Court Denial of needed child support as raised in appeals A-1050-82T1, A-1964-82T3 and A-2106-82T3, clarification of the attached Order relative to all appeals is respectfully requested.

I further respectfully submit that the attached Order Denying Petition for Certification be re-considered, not only for it's omission of addressing three appeals but also on the basis of the need to address and take action on the most highly important issue of Court denied child support.

I further respectfully submit that some reason or reasons should be offered and put clearly on the record as to why the lower and

A-11

higher Courts of New Jersey are choosing to ignore the blatant denial of needed child support to a Court recognized unemployed custodial parent, especially when the non-custodial parent is more than able to assist with the needed child support.

I further respectfully submit and urge that this matter should be given your utmost and most expedient attention since there is a clear exercise of discrimination against a male parent which necessitates my moving before the Supreme Court of the United States of America.

Very truly yours,

Edward Curley
pro se

Encl.

cc: Chief Justice Warren E. Burger CM # P
386 526 507
Chief Justice Robert N. Wilentz CM # P
386 526 508
Attorney General of N.J. CM # P 386 526
509
Clerk-Superior Court Appellate Division

SUPREME COURT OF NEW
JERSEY C-272 SEPTEMBER
TERM 1983

21,831

JOHANNA H. CURLEY, :

Plaintiff-Respondent :

vs. :

EDWARD CURLEY,

CORRECTED ORDER
: ON PETITION FOR
CERTIFICATION

Defendant-Petitioner.:

:

To the Appellate Division, Superior Court:

A petition for certification of the judgment in A-4747-81T1, A-5756-81T1, A-1050-82T1, A-1964-82T3 and A-2106-82T3 having been submitted to this Court, and the Court having considered the same,

It is ORDERED that the petition for certification is denied with costs.

WITNESS, the Honorable Robert N.

Wilentz, Chief Justice, at Trenton, this 21st

A-13

day of November, 1983.

Stephen W. Townsend

Clerk

FILED

SUPREME COURT

Jan 4, 1984

END OF DOCKET